

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****United States Patent and Trademark Office**Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231*AMJ*

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|

08/818, 185 03/14/97 SCHNIER

R R0996-140

TM02/0514

SCOTT A. STINEBRUNER
WOOD, HERRON & EVANS
2700 CAREW TOWER
441 VINE STREET
CINCINNATI OH 45202-2917

EXAMINER

VU, T

21

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2152

DATE MAILED:

05/14/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks*AMJ*

| | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 08/818,185 | Applicant(s) Schnier |
| | Examiner Thong Vu | Art Unit 2152 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on Feb 26, 2001

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-9, 11, 15-36, and 39 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-9, 11, 15-36, and 39 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

a) All b) Some* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

15) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

18) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____

16) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

19) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

17) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

20) Other: _____

1. The applicant arguments filed 09/28/2000 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
2. Claims 1-9, 11, 15-36, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Phillips et al [Phillips 6,151,637] in view of Kessler et al [JavaOne, Remote object for Java].
3. As per claim 1, Phillips discloses an apparatus comprising at least one processor; a memory coupled to the at least one processor; a computer program residing in memory, said computer program enabling client object-server object interaction for an client object located on a (zero install) client, said client object-server object interaction being enabled by delivering an object reference for an naming context object to said (zero install) client after said zero install client has contacted said computer program [Phillips col 7 line 55-col 8 line 63]

However Phillips silent on detail the zero install client. Kessler discloses the zero install client including the client browser interacts to server by applet, ORB naming service to obtain object reference [Kessler pages 13-19].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the zero install client as taught by Kessler into the Phillips's system in order to improve the client-server communication.

4. As per claims 7,21,28,33,34 contain the similar limitations set forth of method claim 1. Therefore, claims 7,21,28,33,34 are rejected for the same rationale set forth claim 1.
5. As per claims 2 and 15 , Phillips-Kessler disclose the computer program comprises a web browser or Java-enable web browser [Kessler page 13]
6. As per claim 3, Phillips-Kessler discloses said contact with computer program is accomplished by a web browser located on said zero install client [Kessler pages 13-19].

7. As per claim 4, Phillips-Kessler disclose object reference is stored in a web server directory [Phillips Fig 5]
8. As per claims 5, 8 and 36, Phillips-Kessler disclose a stringified object reference as inherent feature of object reference [Phillips col 8 lines 40-55]
9. As per claims 6 and 9, Phillips-Kessler disclose a root naming context object as an inherent feature of naming context object [Phillips col 8 lines 40-55]
10. As per claim 11, Phillips-Kessler disclose contact with server system is accomplished by a web browser executing on client system and wherein the step of downloading said object reference comprises downloading by a web server application [Kessler pages 13-19].
11. As per claims 16 and 35, Phillips-Kessler disclose Java-enable web browser containing a COBRA compliant Java Object Request Broker [Phillips col 6 lines 1-118, col 8 lines 13-21]
12. As per claims 17 and 39, Phillips-Kessler disclose server system includes a local service application and the step of downloading the object reference is performed by a web server application in server system [Kessler pages 13-19].
13. As per claim 18, Phillips-Kessler disclose Web server includes a name object server [Kessler pages 13-19].
14. As per claim 19, Phillips-Kessler disclose downloading an applet from web server to web browser and running applet on web browser; downloading an object request broker from web server [Kessler pages 13-19].
15. As per claim 20, Phillips-Kessler disclose downloading the class of the object request broker from web server [Kessler pages 13-19].
16. As per claims 22,23,29-31 and Phillips-Kessler disclose signal bearing media as

transmission media, recordable media or Internet as inherent feature of client-server network [Kessler pages 13-19].

17. As per claims 24-27 contain the similar limitations set forth of method claims 2-6.

Therefore, claims 24-27 are rejected for the same rationale set forth claims 2-6.

18. As per claim 32, Phillips-Kessler disclose web server having access to said object reference [Kessler pages 13-19].

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Thong Vu, whose telephone number is (703)-305-4643.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00AM- 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, *Mark Rinehart*, can be reached at (703) 305-4815.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patent and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to :

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 305-7201 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSAL" or "DRAFT")

Application Number: 08/818185
Art Unit: 2152

4

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 11,2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Thong Vu

May 08, 2001

MEHMET B. GECKIL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Mehmet Geckil